UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/996,271	11/28/2001	Amit Chakraborty	2000P09096 US01	2366

7590 11/03/2004

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
186 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER	
ABEL JALIL, NEVEEN	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2165	

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/996,271	CHAKRABORTY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Neveen Abel-Jalil	2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 September 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,6,8,9 and 23-27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,6,8,9 and 23-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed on September 2, 2004 has been received and entered. Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 9, and 23-27 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 23, and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JONES et al. (U.S Pub. No. 2001/0047373 A1) in view of Fujita et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,650,343 B1).

As to claim 23, JONES et al. discloses a program storage device readable by machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform method steps for creating an anchorable information unit file from a portable document format document, the method steps comprising:

parsing the portable document format document into textual portions and non-text portions (See JONES et al. page 11, column 1, lines 15-34);

extracting structure from the textural portions and the non-text portions (See JONES et al. page 2, paragraph 0013);

determining text within textual portions, and the non-text portions (See JONES et al. page 4, paragraph 0040); and

hyperlinking a plurality of keywords within the textural portions and non-text portions to a related document by creating the anchorable information unit file, wherein the plurality of keywords are anchorable information units (See JONES et al. page 8, paragraphs 0075-0078).

JONES et al. does not teach analyzing a portable document format document to determine page layouts for each page of the portable document format document; identifying a structure of each page layout including text portions and non-text portions for each page.

Fujita et al. teaches analyzing a portable document format document to determine page layouts for each page of the portable document format document; identifying a structure of each page layout including text portions and non-text portions for each page (See Fujita et al. column 19, lines 22-37, also see Fujita et al. column 28, lines 15-44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified JONES et al. to include analyzing a portable document format document to determine page layouts for each page of the portable document format document; identifying a structure of each page layout including text portions and non-text portions for each page.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified JONES et al. by the teaching of Fujita et al. to include analyzing a portable document format document to determine page layouts for each page of the portable document format document; identifying a structure of each page layout including text portions and non-text portions for each page because it provides for customization of information and better classification of related documents.

As to claim 26, JONES et al. as modified discloses wherein the level is one of a paragraph, a heading and a subheading (See JONES et al. page 1, paragraph 0004, prior art, also see JONES et al. page 7, paragraphs 0066-0070, and see JONES et al. page 11, column 2, lines 46-52).

As to claim 27, JONES et al. as modified discloses wherein the step of pattern matching further comprises the steps of:

determining a median font size for the portable document format document (See JONES et al. page 11, column 1, lines 8-14);

comparing a font size of the extracted text to the median font size for the portable document format document (See JONES et al. abstract) and

determining a context according to font size (See JONES et al. page 5, paragraphs 0052-0054).

5. Claims 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JONES et al. (U.S Pub. No. 2001/0047373 A1) in view of Gatto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,344,906 B1).

As to claim 24, JONES et al. does not teach wherein the step of parsing further comprises the step of differentiating color image content from black-and-white content.

Gatto et al. teaches wherein the step of parsing further comprises the step of differentiating color image content from black-and-white content (See Gatto et al. column 16, lines 55-67, and see Gatto et al. column 17, lines 1-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified JONES et al. to include wherein the step of parsing further comprises the step of differentiating color image content from black-and-white content.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified JONES et al. by the teaching of Gatto et al. to include wherein the step of parsing further comprises the step of differentiating color image content from black-and-white content because it provides for image correction and ease of user viewing of embedded images.

As to claim 25, JONES et al. discloses wherein the step of extracting further comprises the steps of:

determining a level for extracted textual portions (See JONES et al. pages 3-4, paragraph 0039, also see JONES et al. page 6, paragraphs 0056-0057);

associating the context with the text (See JONES et al. page 7, paragraphs 0064-0066); and

extracted text to the portable document format document to determine a context and a location (See JONES et al. page 8, paragraphs 0075-0078).

JONES et al. does not teach pattern matching.

Gatto et al. teaches pattern matching (See Gatto et al. column 16, lines 60-67, and see Gatto et al. column 17, lines 1-11).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified JONES et al. to include pattern matching.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified JONES et al. by the teaching of Gatto et al. to include pattern matching because it provides for faster and more accurate processing.

5. Claims 1-3, 6, and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JONES et al. (U.S Pub. No. 2001/0047373 A1) in view of Gatto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,344,906 B1) in view of Fujita et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,650,343 B1).

As to claim 1, JONES et al. discloses a system for processing a multimedia data file to provide information supporting user navigation of multimedia data file content, comprising:

a content parser to identify and locate previously unidentified text and image content of a data file (See JONES et al. page 11, column 1, lines 15-34), the content parser applying text extraction rules to identify text and identify a document structure, wherein context is defined for the identified text based on its associated document structure (See JONES et al. page 5, paragraphs 0050-0052);

a text sorter for parsing said identified text and said identified embedded text to locate text items in accordance with predetermined sorting rules (See JONES et al. page 2, paragraph 0014, also see JONES et al. page 8, paragraph 0082); and

memory for storing a navigation file containing said text items (See JONES et al. page 2, paragraph 0029, and see JONES et al. page 3, paragraph 0037).

JONES et al. does not teach a black and white image processor for processing said identified image content to identify embedded text content by applying object templates, the image processor comprising a pixel smearing component reducing text to a rectangular block of pixels and an image filtering component for cleaning a smeared image.

Gatto et al. teaches a black and white image processor for processing said identified image content to identify embedded text content by applying object templates, the image processor comprising a pixel smearing component reducing text to a rectangular block of pixels and an image filtering component for cleaning a smeared image (See Gatto et al. column 16, lines 55-67, and see Gatto et al. column 17, lines 1-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified JONES et al. to include a black and white image processor for processing said identified image content to identify embedded text content by applying object templates, the image processor comprising a pixel smearing component reducing text to a rectangular block of pixels and an image filtering component for cleaning a smeared image.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified JONES et al. by the teaching of Gatto et al. to include a black and white image processor for processing said identified image content to identify embedded text content by applying object templates, the image processor comprising a pixel smearing component reducing text to a rectangular block of pixels and an image filtering component for cleaning a smeared image because it provides for image correction and ease of user viewing of embedded images.

JONES et al. as modified still does not teach a page layout analyzer to determine page layouts for each page of the multimedia data file, the analyzer identifying a structure of each page layout including text section and image sections of each page.

Fujita et al. teaches a page layout analyzer to determine page layouts for each page of the multimedia data file, the analyzer identifying a structure of each page layout including text section and image sections of each page (See Fujita et al. column 19, lines 22-37, also see Fujita et al. column 28, lines 15-44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have further modified JONES et al. as modified to include a page layout analyzer to determine page layouts for each page of the multimedia data file, the analyzer identifying a structure of each page layout including text section and image sections of each page.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified JONES et al. as modified by the teaching of Fujita et al. to include a page layout analyzer to determine page layouts for each page of the multimedia data file, the analyzer identifying a structure of each page layout

including text section and image sections of each page because it provides for customization of information and better classification of related documents.

As to claim 2, JONES et al. as modified discloses wherein the navigation file links to at least one internal document object (See JONES et al. page 8, paragraph 0076).

As to claim 3, JONES et al. as modified discloses wherein the navigation file links to at least one external document object (See JONES et al. page 8, paragraph 0082).

As to claim 6, JONES et al. as modified discloses wherein the content parser applies pre-defined hierarchical rules for determining a level of identified text (See JONES et al. page 10, column 1, lines 53-62, and see JONES et al. pages 6-7, paragraphs 0062-0063, and see JONES et al. page 1, paragraph 0001, prior art).

As to claim 8, JONES et al. as modified discloses wherein the system refines a search resolution during a text identifying process to determine a location of the embedded text within an image (See JONES et al. page 10, column 1, lines 45-52).

As to claim 9, JONES et al. as modified discloses wherein identified text comprises hyperlinks (See JONES et al. page 6, paragraph 0060).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 6, 8, 9, and 23-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neveen Abel-Jalil whose telephone number is 703-305-8114. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:30PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 703-305-3830. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Neveen Abel-Jalil
October 29, 2004

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER